

A

# IUSTIFICATION

Of two Points now in Controversie with the

# A N A B A P T I S T S

Concerning

## Baptisme:

The first is, That Infants of Christians ought to be Baptized, with grounds to prove it, and their Objections answered.

With a brieve Answer to Master T O M B E S twelve doubtfull Arguments against it in his Exercitation about Infants Baptisme.

Also a brieve Answer to Captaine H O B S O N S five Arguments in his falacy of Infants Baptisme, being (as he saith) that which should have beene disputed by him, and Mr. Knowles, and some others; against Mr. Calamy and Mr. Cranford.

The second Point is, That the Sprinkling the Baptized more agreeth with the minde of Christ then Dipping or Plunging in or under the Water: With grounds to prove it, and a brieve Answer to what they have to say against it.

By T. B.

*T. B. Bakenwell*

John. 3. 1. Beloved, beleeve not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God, because many false prophets are gone out into the world.

Imprimatur John Downham.

Loudon printed for Henry Sheperd at the Bible in Tower-street, and for William Ley at his shop in Pauls Church-yard neere

Jan. 19<sup>th</sup>

Doctors Commons. 1646. 1648



## To the Reader.



Christian Reader, considering it ever was, and still is the custome of all Christian Churches in the world to baptize their Infants, and to sprinkle the Baptized; although it hath been long opposed by the Anabaptists, yet they never left it in any age; then although those men have published many Books of late against it, and no Answer to them is yet come forth, which makes them ready to say with the King of *Assyria*, *I have gathered all the earth, and there was none that moved the wing, or opened the mouth, or peeped forth against it, Isaiah 10. 14.* Yet let not this little book be despised for the unworthinesse of the Author, but read it till some more able hand shall move for thy better satisfaction; thou knowest not but God may sometimes hide things from the wise & prudent, and reveale them to babes, because it so pleaseth him, *Luke 10. 21.* *Aquila* and his Wife rooke *Apollo* that was mighty in Scriptures, and shewed him the way of God more perfectly, *Acts 18.* *Naaman* hearkned to his Maid-servant, when she told him of a Prophet in Israel that would cure him of his Leprosie; and to the advice of another servant, to observe the Prophets directions, *2 King. 5.* Then look not on the Author, but weigh the matter and arguments in the balance of the Sanctuary, and if they hold weight give God the praise, and me thy prayers; and I shall remaine thine in all Christian duties to be commanded

Thomas Bakewell.



The first Point in Controversie with the  
*Anabaptists* is, That Infants of Christians ought to be  
 Baptized: the grounds to prove it are these following.



First, if Christ commanded, and his Apostles practised the Baptisme of Infants, then it ought to be done; but Christ commanded to Baptize all Nations, whereof Infants are a part, Mat. 28. 19. and the Apostles Baptized whole Households, whereof Infants are a part, Acts 16. 15. 33. 1 Cor. 1. 16. therefore Infants of Christians ought to be baptized.

Secondly, if Christian Infants have the promise to be baptized with the Holy Ghost, then they ought to have the outward forme of Baptisme; but the Holy Ghost is promised to Christians and their children, Acts 2. 38, 39. therefore their children ought to be baptized.

Thirdly, If Infants of Christians be separated from Turkes and Infidels by vertue of their Parents Baptisme, then they ought to be Baptized; but Infants of Christians have this marke of distinction, For now saith *Paul*, Your children are holy, 1 Cor. 7. 14. that is, they have an outward sanctification, being distinguished from Infidels, for the visible Church therefore they ought to be Baptized.

Fourthly, If Christ did admit Infants to come unto him, and blamed them that would keepe them backe, and giving this testimony of them, that those little children which he had in his Armes did beleve on him, and that they had a right to the Kingdome of Heaven, then they ought to be Baptized; But the first is true, Mat. 18. 3. 6, 19. 13. 14. Mark 9. 36. 10. 14. 10. Luke 18. 15. 16. therefore Infants of Christians ought to be Baptized.

Fifthly, If infants of Jewes were circumcised, and Christ came not to take away that benefit from them, but to change it to a better and larger benefit, from Males alone to Males and Females, and from one Nation to all Nations, and from a painefull duty to an easie duty, then I say that Christian infants ought to be Baptized as well as the Jewish infants were circumcised; but Christ never repealed that Command, but did enlarge it to all Nations, Mat. 28. 19. and to both men and women, Acts 8. 12. 16. 15. therefore Christian infants ought to be baptized.

Sixthly, if the Apostles businesse was onely to convert men of yeares from false religion to the Christian Religion, before they did admit them

to Baptisme, and did not wait till they were converted, from the state of corrupted nature to the state of Grace, because they knew no mans heart, having the first conversion they baptized many without the second; then Christian Infants who have no fall religion to be converted from, ought to be baptized, although they be not converted from the state of corruption to the state of Grace; but the Apostles onely required men to beleve that Christ was the Sonne of God, the Eunuch beleved this and was baptized, and *Simon Magus* beleved this and was baptized, although still in the gall of bitternesse, and in the bonds of iniquity, Acts 8. 12. 23. 37. and many beleved the Scripture, and the words of Jesus, many beleved in his name, yet Christ would not trust them although they were his Disciples, for he knew their hearts, and needed not that any should testifie of them, yet those went away from Christ and never returned to him, Joh. 2. 23, 24. 6. 66. this shewes they had onely the first conversion, and not the second; and Jewish infants were circumcised, if the Parents was but of their Religion, never waiting for the childes conversion from corrupted nature to the state of Grace, and Christians have as much power to bring up their children in the Christian Religion, as they had to bring them up in the Jewish Religion; then it is a cleare truth that Christian infants ought to be baptized.

*Their Objections are next to be answered.*

**F**irst they Object; If they must first be taught before they be Baptized, then infants may not be baptized; but the first is true, Mat. 28. 19. ergo, so is the second. *I ans.* The teaching them to observe, and to doe all that is commanded in that place, followes both Preaching and Baptisme that both may be observed; else it were to affirme that Christ would have one Ordinance to be observed and not the other, when as he saith, *Observe and doe whatsoever I have commanded you;* ver. 19 20. And to say Teaching is first set downe is not much to the purpose; if it be, then *John* did Baptize in the Wildernesse, and then it is said, he Preached the Baptisme of Repentance, Mark 1. 4. and Christ saith, *A man must be borne of water, and then of the Spirit,* Iohn 3. 5. and *John the Baptist* said, *I baptize you with water, but he comes after that baptizeth with the holy Ghost,* Mat. 3. 11. but Master *Tambes* saith, To baptize infants is to baptize those whom the Lord hath not apointed to be baptized; and yet he grants, that infants may be baptized with the holy Ghost, and might be baptized if they were knowne to us from that Text, Acts 10. 47. But saith he, To baptize infants because Christ commands to Baptize all Nations is very faulty; First in casting away that restriction which Christ hath put. Secondly, in determining that all men whatsoever are to be baptized, and so it is no priviledge to beleivers and their children, but as common to Infidels as to their children. *I answer.* Here he denies the command of Christ to be a Rule, and



and would make a restriction where Christ makes none, and then he makes a false conclusion, as if he ever said, or did intend to baptize the children of Infidels before their Parents be taught the Covenant, and so by baptism were admitted into the Christian Church; but yet in other places he saith himselfe, that beleevers children have no priviledge above the children of Infidels, but because he slights this generall command to all Nations, which includes all sorts of Mankinde, because he hath not a speciall command for Infants onely, I may say to him as Christ said to the Pharisees, when they said, to sweare by the Temple was nothing, but he that swore by the gold of it was a debtor; so the command to Baptize all Nations is nothing, unlesse it were for infants onely, when as the Temple sanctifies the gold, Mat. 23. 16. 17. and the whole Nation includes infants, but he must have them Disciples first, because it was reported that Christ made and baptized Disciples, John 4. 2. when as he grants it to be a false report, therefore nothing can safely be drawne from it, but I shall give a further answer to this, and Captaine *Hobsons* third agreement together. Againe, suppose we grant that men of yeares, who are converted from false religions to the true Christian Religion, that such must be taught the Covenant, being capable of Teaching before they have the token of it given to them; thus it was with *Abraham*, and with many Heathens when they were converted to the Jewes religion; but when they were admitted their infants had a right to it without any teaching going before; and when they were capable they taught them the Covenant as they were commanded, Deut. 4. 10. 13. and so they taught them the meaning of the Pascheover, Exod. 12. 26. 27. then why may not Christian infants be taught the Covenant after they have received the token of it as well as Jewish infants. Againe, as they were meeke passives when they received the token of the Covenant, so are our infants, the worke is done upon them therefore they may be baptized.

Secondly, they Object, That if they must repent before they be baptized, then infants may not be baptized; but the first is true, Acts 2. 38. *ergo*, so is the second. *I answer*. It is true in men of yeares that are converted from Heathens to the Christian Religion, but it is neither required of Jewish infants before Circumcision, nor of Christian infants before Baptisme; for as they Circumcised their infants, so *John* baptized them before or unto repentance, Mat. 3. 11. therefore Christian infants ought to be baptized; but what if the Saduces and Pharisees, and the bloody Murderers of Christ be called upon to repent before either *John*, or *Peter* will admit them to baptism, will it follow that infants of Christians must doe so actually before they be admitted to Baptisme? the one of these was a generation of Vipers, having the leaven of false doctrine that must be purged out, Mat. 16. 13. else like Vipers it would eat out the heart and life of

Christian Religion, Mat. 3. 7. and the other was the leaven of prophane-  
 nesse, which like savage Beasts would trample Religion under their feet,  
 then this also must be purged out, 1 Cor. 5. 7. 13. then as both must be  
 purged out, so they must be both kept out. But will it follow, that infants  
 must repent of Murthers and Heresies before they be admitted to Baptisme,  
 let them that would have them to repent of those foule sinnes prove them  
 guilty of them, or else they are very unjust to debarre them of the Privi-  
 ledges of the Church, and actually Excommunicate them without any  
 tryall or just prooffe against them, and till then we must hold that they  
 ought to be baptized.

Thirdly they Object, If none must be Baptized but such as are called,  
 then Infants of Christians may not be Baptized. But the first is true, Act 1.  
 39. *ergo*, so is the second. *I Answer*. It is true, to those as farre off, they must  
 be called to the Christian Religion, but it is not true to Christians already  
 called, nor required of their Infants any more then it was of Jewish In-  
 fants, for by vertue of their call their Children are holy, 1 Cor. 7. 14.  
 and ought to be baptized.

Fourthly, they Object, That if none must be baptized but those that con-  
 fesse their sinnes, then Infants must not be baptized. But the first is true, Mat.  
 3. 6. *ergo*, so is the second. *I answer*. This also is true in men of yeares, who  
 are converted from Heathenisme to the Christian Religion; so it was when  
 any were converted to the Jewish Religion, but what is this to Infants, ei-  
 ther Jewes, or Christians. Againe, when multitudes came to *Jahn* to be  
 baptized of him, some few of them might confesse the sinnes of all, as being  
 the mouth of the people to God, as any Minister is in his Congregation,  
 then this hinders not; but theirs and our Infants may be baptized.

Fifthly, they Object, If none must be baptized but such as beleeve, then  
 Infants may not be baptized. But the first is true, Mark 16. 16. Acts 8. 36,  
 37. *ergo*, so is the second. *I Answer*. If none but such as we know doe truly  
 beleve must be baptized, then we must baptize none at all, because we  
 know no mans heart, and Faith is that new name written which none  
 knowes but he that receives it, Revel. 2. 7. Againe, if none must be bap-  
 tized but true beleivers, and we cannot know them, we may soone mistake,  
 and see the token of the Covenant upon Reprobates, and refuse to give  
 it to the Elect. Againe, Christ said, Those little ones that he tooke in his  
 Armes did beleve in him, see Mat. 16. 6. compared with Luke 9. 26, and  
 their hearts may as well be knowne to us as the hearts of men of yeares;  
 for we know the hearts of none. Again, that faith that was required  
 was but to beleve that Christ was the Son of God, and that the Chri-  
 stian Religion was the true Religion; but Infants of Christians have taken  
 up no false Religion, then it need not be required that they should beleve  
 the true, being brought up in none other. Againe, to baptize none but  
 those



those that doe truly beleewe were the direct way to cast out the token of the *Covenant* altogether, because we cannot truly know them, then wee ought not to neglect this duty to baptize Infants.

Sixthly, They say, if none ought to be baptized but such as make profession of justifying faith, then Infants ought not to be baptized; but Infants cannot make such profession. And saith Master *Tombes*, Neither *John the Baptist*, nor the Apostles would baptize any without some shewes of faith and repentance. And although he grants, that Infants may have a right to Heaven, yet they must not be baptized till that appeare. But I say, their hearts will never be knowne to us, then they had as good say they shall never be baptized, as to say, they shall not be baptized till they know their hearts. Againe, would not the Apostles baptize any unlesse they professe a lye, & that in the presence of Christ who knew their hearts, and then might they lawfully be baptized when they had professed a lye in the presence of Christ, for they baptized alwaies in his presence before his death, *John*. 3. 22. 26. 42. that they might be his Disciples and not theirs. And would Christ have all those to professe that they had true justifying faith? when as he knew their hearts and would not trust them, *John*. 2. v. 23, 24. What horrible blasphemy is this? No, they were required but to beleewe that Christ was the Sonne of God, and his Religion was the true Religion, and then they had right to Baptisme in the approbation of Christ and his Apostles; and their parents profession might be imputed to the child, because they have power to bring them up in that Religion they professe, as well as the Jewes had power to bring up their Infants in their Religion; neither had their Infants any other profession but that of their parents; then christian Infants may as well be baptized as Jewish Infants were circumcised.

Seventhly, They object against my second ground, saying, The gift of the Holy Ghost there promised, *Act*. 2. 39. is not the sanctifying Gift, but the gift of Tongues, and miracles to cast out Divels, and to cure all manner of diseases, *Mark*. 16. 17. I answer. *John the Baptist* was filled with the Holy Ghost from his mothers wombe, *Luk*. 1. 15. to shew that as he was fit for Baptisme from the wombe, so he should judge of others: Neither could that be the gift of tongues, nor the gift of miracles as soon as he was borne, but the gift of sanctification which *Jeremiah* had before he was borne, *Jer*. 1. 5. Then if Infants may be so baptized with the Holy Ghost, wee may not deny them the outward forme of Baptisme. But saith Master *Tombes*, That promise is to Jewes that were called of the sending of Christ, from these Texts, *Act*. 3. 25. 16. 13. 32. 33. This we grant. But then he saith, Mention is made of a Promise, not as of it selfe, yeelding right to Baptisme without repentance, but as a motive to those that repent and are baptized. But to this we grant, that Baptisme without repentance is of no value;

value; But when we heare the Baptisme of the Holy Ghost is promised to christian Infants, and they have power to bring them up in the christian Religion, then I would know why such may not be baptized, having no false Religion to repent of, and the promise of the inward Baptisme; thus sure their parents that have power to bring them up in the true Religion, have also power to set the marke of a christian upon them, to be knowne from Turks and Infidels. But then he saith, That Promise was made to Jewish Infants, and therefore not to christian Infants, but this is a meere cavill against the Text, and not worth answering.

Eighthly, They object against my third ground, saying, That the holynesse which children have from their parents, is nothing else but this, those parents have a sanctified use of them, for unto the pure, all things are pure, *Tit. 1. 15*. I answer, If all things be pure unto them, then other mens children, yea Infidels children are pure unto them, yea the stones and Beasts of the Field are at peace with them, *Job. 5. 23*. yea they have a sanctified use both of the evill of sinne and the evill of punishment, for all things shall worke together for their good that love God, *Rom. 3. 28*. but this benefit comes not by marrying of beleevvers, but by our marriage with Christ; but this had beene to small purpose for *Paul* to say, That beleevvers have a sanctified use of their children, when as he had not only said before, they have a sanctified use of them, but of all things else; then the meaning is this, they have such a holynesse as the Jewes had, to distinguish them from other Nations, to be of the church of God, a holy Nation; so Infants of christians are distinguished from Turks and Infidels, to be of the visible church, as well as the Jewish Infants by this marke of distinction: now they are holy, therefore they ought to be baptized. But Master *Tombes* saith, That holynesse spoken by *Paul*, *1 Cor. 7. 14*. is nothing else but this, they are legitimate, that is, they are not bastards. To this I answer, That the *Corinthians* were Gentiles or Heathens before *Paul* preached amongst them, and by his preaching some times he converted a wife to the christian Religion, and could not convert the husband, and sometimes the husband and not the wife, but if either of them was converted from their dumbe Idols wherein they were led, *1 Cor. 12. 2* to the christian faith, now, saith *Paul*, your children are holy: It seemes when either of them was converted the great question to the Apostle was this, Whether their children had a right to the Ordinance of Baptisme, and so to all other priviledges of the christian church? To this a secret answer is implied, That they had a right to all the Ordinances and priviledges of the christian church, for now, saith *Paul*, your children are holy, that is, they are distinguished now from Heathens and Infidels children, so that now one of the parents is become a christian, it cannot be said now that they are Infidels children; but when both the parents were converted to the



the christian Religion, then the matter was out of question, so that then they need not aske whether their children should enjoy the privileges of the christian church; this being the true genuine meaning of the Text: Now let us see what truth is in Master *Tombes* interpretation of it, saying, Now they are legitimate, now they are not bastards; but can any rationally man think this, that if a mans wife was converted to the christian Religion, that then shee would come to the Apostles to aske them whether or not their children were bastards; could any man living tell that better then shee her selfe; if shee were a whore then they were bastards, but not else. Againe, them that were lawfully married before *Paul* came amongst them, and had children, they were not bastards by Master *Tombes* owne confession; but saith *Paul* of those children, that they were uncleane then, but now saith he, they are holy, because one of the Parents is become a christian, now those children are not heathens but christians; so then, if the same children which before were uncleane, and now are holy by the conversion of one of the Parents, it must needs be such a holinesse to distinguish them from Infidels, to be of the true christian Church; then he that denies this truth, must needs draw this conclusion, that the same children which before *Paul* came there were bastards, but now one of the Parents is converted to the christian Religion, those children that were bastards and uncleane, are now holy and no bastards. Againe, shall we be such fools, as to think, because the husband is a Christian, that his christianity will so sanctifie his wife, that shee cannot have a bastard, or will her being a christian so sanctifie her husband that he cannot have a bastard; if this were true, then how comes it to passe that we have so many bastards in *Engl.* when both the husband & the wife profess themselves to be christians, and yet sometimes both of them are so prophane as to have bastards? then I say, that holinesse spoken of by *Paul* is that mark of distinction to be knowne from Turks and Infidels to be of the visible Church of Christ, and therefore have a true right to baptism, and so to all other Ordinances and privileges of the christian Church, although infancy or sicknesse may hinder them from some of them; yet it cannot from baptism, being onely passive, the work is done upon them, and no action required of them, therefore they may and ought to be baptized.

Ninthly, they object against my fifth ground, saying, that command of God ceased, which did command to set the token of the Covenant upon Jewish Infants, when Christ came and changed that token of circumcision into baptism: But I say, the command remaines, although the token be changed; as for instance: God commanded the children

of Israel to keepe holy the seventh day, for it was the Sabbath of the Lord their God; but this command remaines, although by Christ the day was changed; and so for other commands to Israel, thou shalt have no other gods but me; thou shalt not make to thy selfe any graven image, nor bow downe unto it, nor take the name of the Lord thy God in vaine; but although the Church of the Jewes be cut off, and the christian Church grafted in, we may not say these commands were repeald when the Church was changed, and so conclude that Christians may have other gods, and bow downe to them, and worship them, and take the name of Israels God in vaine, because the command was not made to us, but to them; nor keep no Sabbath, because the command was made to them and not to us; nor set the token of the Covenant on our children, because it was to them and not to us, because our Church and Sablath, and token of the Covenant was all changed; then unlesse you be minded to cast off God, the Sabbath, the Sacraments, the true Religion, let your children be baptized.

Tenthly, they object, saying, those that have a right to one of the Sacraments, have a right to both, but Infants have no right to the Lords Supper, because they cannot examine themselves, nor remember the death of Christ, nor discern his body in the Sacrament, then Infants may not be baptized. *I answ.* Those impediments that hinder them from receiving the Lords Supper, are no impediments to hinder them from Baptisme, because nothing is required in the baptized Infants; they are meerly passive, the work is done upon them, when as the Lords Supper requires many actions, as to take, eat, doe this, in men of age and understanding. Againe, I doubt not but Infants have a right to both Sacraments, and all other Ordinances, although by naturall infirmities they are for the present disabled from some of them, as by sicknesse or infancy; yet this hinders not, nor disables any from Baptisme, therefore Infants ought to be baptized, although baptisme is not of absolute necessity where it cannot be had, yet this contempt of it is damnable, but in times of persecution, or in a journey, it may be deferred, as Israel did in the Wildernesse forty yeers, *Josh. 5. 5.* but they might not doe so in *Canaan*, for if they doe, it may be their children when they come to age would despise that Ordinance, and then they are to be cut off from *Israel*, because they have broken the Covenant, *Gen. 17. 14.* and how doe these men know but their children will despise the covenant when they come to age? Nay, I dare say, it is the onely way to make them despise it when they come to age; for it is said, *all the people that heard Christ, and the Publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptisme of John (that is) with water, Mat. 3. 11.* but the Pharises and Lawyers rejected the



the Councell of God, being not baptized of John, Luke 7.29.30. And it were a just judgement of God upon such Parents, that will not set that mark of distinction, to sever their children from Turks by baptisme, that they should never be severed from corrupted nature to the state of grace; then to avoid this, let them be baptized.

Eleventhly, they object, that if Christ, who saith, *learne of me*, was not baptized till he was 30 years old, then Infants must not be baptized, Luke 3.23. But the first is true, ergo, so is the second. *I answ.* It is true that Christ bad us learne of him to be humble and meek, Mat. 11.28. but he did not bid us learne of him to be 30 years old before that we be baptized, and if we learne that, we must neither be more nor lesse but just of his age. Again, he was both circumcized and baptized, but he did not bid us learne both. Again, at thirty yeeres old he put an end to the Jewish Religion, and could not be baptized before; neither could he set up Christian Religion, till he had put downe the Jewish Religion: But I would not have the Anabaptists to tarry till they be thirty years old before they become Christians, and say they learned to doe so of Christ. Again, at the same time, others were baptized at severall ages, Some more, some lesse then the age of Christ; then the matter lay in this, whether they were converted from false Religions to the true Religion, although they were not converted from the state of corrupted nature to the state of grace, they baptized them; we read of none that ever were denied to be baptized but the Pharises and Sadduces who came to John to be baptized; but he refused to baptize them, because they would not leave their sects and scismes, they would be Pharises and Sadduces still, therefore he calls them *A generation of Vipers*, Mat. 3.7. because such would eat out the bowels of the christian Church; this might be an item to all the sects and scismes amongst us, who are no better then Vipers both to Church and State; but when any was admitted to Baptisme, if they did but beleve that Christ was the Sonne of God, and his was the true Religion; I say, although they should become Papists or prophane drunkards, or swearers, or adulterers, and should be excommunicated for such wickednesse, yet still they having a right to the Ordinances, as a Free-man hath of a Corporation, although for the present he be in prison, and cannot make use of it, till he hath compounded with his adversaries, and this man given satisfaction to the Church; therefore his children ought to be baptized, unless the Parents turn Turks, and so renounce Christ and christian Religion; yet if but one of them should doe this, their children are holy, and ought to be baptized, notwithstanding all other failings whatsoever.

Twelfthly, they object, if none must be baptized, and so receive the

token of the Covenant but such as have the Covenant, then Infants must not be baptized; but they say the first is true, because they are incapable to receive the covenant, therefore they ought not to be baptized, which is the token of the covenant. Here I might answer, that christian Infants are as capable both to receive the covenant and the token of it, as the Jewish Infants were; but it is not true to say they onely that have the covenant must have the signes and tokens of it, for the male children of the Jewes all had the token of the covenant, both the elect and reprobates without any difference, and women which were in the covenant of grace as well as men, yet the signe and token of it was set onely on men, though reprobates, rather then on women, though never so faithfull; for the token of the covenant is not given as a personall benefit to all that have it, but it is given for the good of Gods people, who ought to rejoyce and be thankfull for it where-ever they see it; God made a covenant with *Adam*, but the token of it was set on trees; and God made a covenant with *Noah*, but the token of it was set in the clouds; so God might have set the token of the covenant of grace in the clouds or on trees, or onely on wicked men if he had so pleased; then shall we quarrell with God, and say, we will have the token of the covenant set onely on such as have the covenant, as if the rain-bow should be set on all men since *Noahs* flood; no, let us do as faithfull women did in the Church of the Jewes, who could rejoyce and be thankfull for the token of the covenant of grace, although it was not set on them but on men onely, and many of them reprobates; yet we doe not find that ever they murmured against God, because they had not the token of the covenant upon them as well as men; then I conclude, notwithstanding these objections, that christian Infants ought to be baptized.

But Master *Tombes* hath some more places of Scripture to examine, the first is *Gen. 17. 7.* from which we prove that God did establish his everlasting Covenant to *Abraham*; and verse 21. he established that everlasting covenant also with *Iaac*; and being established thus to *Abraham* and *Iaac*, then it was also confirmed unto *Jacob*, for an everlasting covenant, *Psal. 105. 10.* But this covenant was made with Christ from all eternity; so *Prov. 8. 23.* *1 Pet. 1. 20.* *Titus 1. 2.* now circumcision was a token of that everlasting covenant, *Gen. 17. 10, 11.* and not a token that they should enjoy the land of *Canaan*, and so it suites with baptisme, which is also a token of that everlasting covenant, which God the Father made with God the Son from all eternity; but Master *Tombes* saith, that Covenant to which circumcision had relation, being established to *Abraham*, that he saith was a mixed covenant, and therefore not the same with ours. *I answer,* All temporall promises both to *Abrahams* posterity and also to us, are but the overflow-  
 ing of those promises contained in that everlasting covenant, for godlinesse  
 hath



hath the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come, 1 Tim. 4. 8. seek the righteousness of Christ, and all these things shall be added unto you, Mat. 6. 33. so then, we have as many promises of outward things as the Jewes had; but then to encrease his doubting, he saith, *Abraham's seed* is many wayes to be taken. *I answ.* The seed to whom the covenant was made was but one, and that was Christ, Gal. 3. 16. and to all the elect when they are grafted into Christ by faith, as we enter into the first *Adams* covenant when we come to have his image of nature, so we come into the second *Adams* covenant when we come to have his image of grace; now circumcision was the token of this covenant to the Jewes, as baptism is to Christians; but I shall speak more fully of this, in answer to Captaine *Hobsons* first argument.

Secondly, Master *Tombes* saith, to encrease his doubtings, that if baptism succeed circumcision, then none but males ought to be baptized, because none but males were circumcised, and *John Baptist* did baptize before circumcision of right ceased, therefore it doth not succeed circumcision, although they both signifie the righteousness of faith, Rom. 4. 11. 6. 3. 1 Pet. 3. 21. and the same sanctification of the heart, Col. 2. 11, 12. But saith he, they differ in some things; first, circumcision did signifie, that Christ should come of *Iaac*, Gen. 17. 21. but baptism doth signifie his death and resurrection. *I answ.* although they are both tokens of the same covenant, yet they may in some things differ in their signification, and yet agree well together, thus: circumcision more lively signified mortification, and the death of sinne in the crucifying and death of Christ, and of justifying the sinner by the blood of Christ; and baptism more cleerly signifies the buriall of sinne in the buriall of Christ, and rising from the death of sinne to the life of grace by the resurrection of Christ, and washing away our sinnes by the spirit of Christ, he being under water, and arose out of the water, and as water washeth away the filth of our bodies, so the blood of Christ washeth away our sinnes; but to say circumcision was a token, that Christ should come of *Iaac*, Master *Tombes* contradicts it himselfe, saying, *John* baptized before circumcision should of right cease, and yet Christ was borne thirty yeeres before, which hangs together like harpe and harrow; and *Paul* circumcised *Timothy* after Christs ascension, see Acts 16. 3. and after he had preached of his resurrection many times; but this had been notoriously wicked, if circumcision had signified that Christ was yet for to come of *Iaac*; secondly, he saith circumcision signified that the Israelites were seperated from all Nations; but I say no, for if any would turne to the Jewes Religion they should be circumcized, let them be of what Nation they would; so then it was onely a note of distinction of their Religion from all other, and that they onely had the true visible Church of God, and so baptism is one mark of the christian Church, whereby it is known from

from Turks and Infidels: Thirdly, he saith circumcision signified that Moses Law was to be observed, from *Gal. 5. 3.* But how can that be, when it was not given till four hundred yeers after: fourthly, he saith circumcision did signe the promise of the Land of *Canaan* to them, and baptisme signes eternall life by Christ: But I say, they both signifie and signe the promise of that everlasting covenant made with Christ for the elect, yet not to all that have it, but to Gods people that are amongst us; and for *Canaan*, I say it was but an overplus, of those promises which we enjoy as well as the Jewes, when as spirituall and eternall mercies were the principall things intended in that everlasting covenant; and whereas he said, if baptisme succeed circumcision, then none but males must be baptized. I have answered, the command by Christ is now enlarged to all Nations, and to females; if this man be not faithlesse, but faithfull, I suppose this may satisfie the doubt from this Scripture, why christian Infants may not be baptized.

Thirdly, his examination of other Scriptures, to encrease his doubtings are these, *Acts 16. 15, 32, 33. 18. 8.* *1 Cor. 1. 16.* he saith, the words to the Jaylor were spoke to all in his house, and he rejoyced, beleeving God with all his household; and *Crispus* beleeyed God with all his house, and was baptized; hence he concludes, that the name of the whole house is to be understood, that those which beleeyed in it onely were baptized: But I have answered already, that if but one of the Parents become a christian, the children are holy, which cannot be denied by any Scripture or sound reason: And againe, he hath said nothing of *Liddias* household; and besides, although the Jaylor had servants which beleeyed by hearing and seeing the Apostles carriage in the prison, yet *Liddia* was a stranger, going to heare *Paul* preach, was converted, and he came and baptized her whole household immediately, and it may be never saw them before; neither was it materiall, whether children was of age or not, it may suffice, that they baptized whole households, of which Infants was a part; and I say againe, although they were uncleane before, if but one of the Parents beleeyed, and was baptized, yet now they are holy, and if both Parents professe themselves christians, which is our case in *England*, the matter is out of doubt, there Infants ought to be baptized. Againe, when God gave the token of the covenant to *Abraham*, he commanded that the token should be set on all the males in his house, and he accordingly obeyed, and did so, *Gen. 17. 12. 27.* and saith the Lord, *I know that Abraham will teach his children and his household after him to keep the way of the Lord, Gen. 18. 19.* and saith *Joshua*, *as for me and my household we will serve the Lord, Josh. 24. 15.* Now I have said and proved before, that Christ came not to take away the token of the covenant, but to change it, and to enlarge it, but the covenant and the command are both the same, and remaine still; see my answer to the ninth Objection; then it is cleare, that if households were circumcised and baptized, then our Infants may and ought to be baptized.



I shall answer two Questions: Suppose where heathens and christians live in a land together, yet at some distance, and the heathen should take away a christians Infant before it be baptized, and resolve to keep it by violence from them, only they will give the christian leave to come with a Minister and baptize it, but they will not part with the child; now may this man goe and baptize it, and engage himselfe to bring it up in the christian Religion: *I answ.* No; it were sin and folly to promise that which he cannot performe, the child being kept out of his hands by Infidels; yea, it were as bad and sinfull to doe as those did under the Prelats government, who did engage themselves, that the child should forsake the devill and all his works, and all the luits of the flesh, and beleve the Articles of the christian faith, and keepe all Gods Commandements, therefore it ought not to be done. The second Question is this; suppose a child of heathenish Infidels, should by some providence of God, lawfully come under the government of christians, ought the child to be baptized? *I answ.* Yes, because they have power to bring it up in the christian Religion, therefore *Abraham* was commanded to circumcise al the males in his house, some of them being children of Infidels, because the Lord knew that *Abraham* would command his household to doe that which is right in the sight of the Lord, *Gen. 18. 19.* and christians have the same power to bring up those under their government in the christian Religion; and this also may answer Master *Tombes*, when he saith, *Infants baptisme may be a meanes to baptize them of uncertaine progeny*: But I say, if christians have power to bring them up in the christian Religion, and they can bring them up in no other, because the whole Kingdome hath embraced it; neither need they now to have any sureties to engage themselves to bring them up in it, seeing the whole Kingdome hath embraced it and doe professe it.

Fourthly, Master *Tombes* saith, Baptisme is doubtfull, because it cannot be proved that it was in use in the next age after the Apostles. Fifthly, Master *Tombes* saith, Infants baptisme is doubtfull, because in the succeeding age afterwards, it was held to be a written tradition. *I answ.* If it be proved that it was in the Apostles times, and that by the command of Christ, then the Apostacy of the times cannot make it unlawfull; but the first is proved sufficiently, yet more shall be said to it in answer to Captaine *Hobson's* third argument; then this doth not justly hinder christians Infants from baptisme.

Sixthly, Master *Tombes* saith, Infants baptisme hath occasioned many humane inventions to underprop it: First, sureties in baptisme; secondly, episcopall confirmation; thirdly, the reformed union by examination before the Communion; fourthly, the Church-covenant as it is in New-England. *I answ.* these are all meere scandals cast upon the Presbyteriall government, which doth utterly suppress them all.

Seventhly,

Seventhly, Master *Tombes* saith, Infants baptisme hath occasioned or hath been as the birth to foster many errours; first, that baptisme conferres grace by the work done; secondly, baptisme is regeneration; thirdly, that Infants dying, are saved by the faith of the Parents; fourthly, that some regenerate may fall from grace. *I answ.* The abuse of Infants baptisme doth not nullifie it, neither can it be truly said to be the ground of these errours, for we hold that it may be done upon reprobates as well as circumcision was, neither is it a personall benefit to those that have it, but it is onely given as a benefit to the godly, who live amongst them; and so the baptisme of reprobates may benefit the godly, although it doth not benefit themselves that have it.

Eightly, Master *Tombes* saith, baptisme of Infants causeth many faults in discipline, and in divine worship, and in conversation, such as these; first private baptisme; secondly, baptisme of Infants; thirdly, baptisme by women; fourthly, baptisme of uncertaine Progeny; fifthly, baptisme in the name of the Lord, who know not the Lord nor have ever consented, and perhaps will never consent to the confession of the name of the Lord: sixthly, it hath brought in the admission of ignorant and prophane to the communion of the Lords supper: seventhly, it perverts the order of discipline to baptize and then to catechize: eighthly, it turnes the Sacrament into a ceremony or prophane feasting: ninthly, it makes men forget that ever they were baptized: tenthly, it takes away or diminisheth zeale and industry to know the Gospell. *I answ.* Most of these are scandals without any prooffe, as the five last, and there is but one of the other five altogether unlawfull, and that is baptisme by women; and yet this is held by some Anabaptists to be lawfull, which is not lawfull, but abominable, and he makes a perhaps to the fifth, where there is no cause, for the Parents have power to bring them up to professe the christian Religion, which is as much as the Apostles required before they did admit them to baptisme; then these ten faults are not sufficient to hinder christian Infants from baptisme.

Ninthly, Master *Tombes* saith, that Infants baptisme is an occasion of many unnecessary disputes, fostering contention, which can never be determined by any certaine rule, such as these; first, baptizing Infants of excommunicated persons: secondly, baptizing Infants of apostates: thirdly, baptizing Infants of Parents that are not members of a gathered Church: fourthly, baptizing Infants of those whose Ancestors were beleevers, and the next Parents remaining still in unbelieve. *I answ.* the first and last of these the Church of *England* makes no doubt of, nor of the second, unlesse they turne Turks, and so renounce the christian Religion; and the third is a meer cavill of Independents, for he that is baptized into the christian faith and Religion, is a member of the christian Church, where-ever he is; then notwithstanding this argument, christian Infants ought to be baptized.

Tenthly,



Tenthly, Master *Tomber* saith, That Baptisme of Infants was opposed in the midst of the darknesse of Popery, by the same men that opposed invocation of Saints, and prayer for the dead, and adoration of the Crosse. *I answer*, In the midst of that darknesse some light might be hid from those that sought to bring in the light of the Gospell; but we need not to fetch prooffe from those darke times, for *Luther* denied some part of Scripture to be the Word of God, and he held consubstantiation, ubiquity of Christs body, and yet he withstood Popery more powerfully then any of those before him. Then this cannot hinder Infants Baptisme.

Eleventhly, Master *Tomber* saith, the assertors of Infants Baptisme do not agree amongst themselves, upon what foundation they may build it. *I answer*, Though severall men bring severall arguments for it, this cannot nullifie it. Again, they all agree in the command of Christ, and the promise of sanctifying grace, and the blessing and testimony of Christ on them, and of that holinesse of distinction from Turks and Infidels; and if some bring more arguments to confirme it, shall this make it void? and what truth is that which was never opposed by some? then this cannot hinder Infants Baptisme.

Lastly, Master *Tomber* saith, Infants Baptisme seemes to take away one of the prime ends of Baptisme, which was to shew and confesse himselfe to be a Disciple; but this I have already answered severall times, so then, notwithstanding all these doubtfull arguments, here is nothing that may justly hinder Christian Infants from Baptisme.

All these doubts are briefly mentioned by Master *Tomber* in the beginning of his Booke, Intituled, *An exhortation of Infants Baptisme*, before his Answer to Master *Marshall*; therefore I forbore to set downe the severall pages to finde them.

Here I shall speake something touching re-Baptizing, or often baptizing, because Master *Tomber* in his great Booke seemes to favour it, saying, If we had as cleare Scripture for Infants Baptisme as we have for re-baptizing, our controversie would soone be ended; and by other such like passages in his Booke. It appeares that he favours re-baptizing or often Baptisme; then suppose any that is baptized in the Church of *England* should question the lawfulnessse of their Baptisme, saying, I was not rightly baptized because I was an Infant, and knew not what was done, but this I have already answered; then suppose another say, I was sprinkled, which is to rinse and not to baptize, therefore I was not rightly baptized; this I shall answer in the second point. Then suppose another say, I was baptized either by a drunken Priest, that cannot preach and baptize as he ought, *Mat. 23. 19.* or else by a Popish Priest, who had his Ordination from Popish Bishops, therefore I was not rightly baptized, and may be re-baptized. But here I would know how our Anabaptists Preachers can prove their

once calling lawfull; If they say that they are teaching Disciples, then  
 where is their Ordination? it was either from men of other callings, who  
 have nothing to do in it, or else they have none at all; and how was their  
 first teacher made? it was sure the Divell that first moved him from his  
 place and calling to become their Teacher. And if they say, his Calling  
 was extraordinary, like that of the Apostles, then we would see their ex-  
 traordinary Gifts, and till then we cannot believe their Calling to be  
 lawfull, and so themselves ought not to preach nor baptize; thus while  
 they judge our Ministers they condemne themselves; And for our Bishops  
 and Ministers I answer and say; That they were ordained by men of their  
 owne calling, to preach and to administer the Sacraments, and thus it  
 hath bene successively from the Apostles, and although the Bishops had  
 power and authority given them by men to rule over their Brethren, which  
 they ought not, yet that did not make void that which they had from  
 God, for then that or any other sinne, would make that or any other cal-  
 ling void, so that a man must either live without sinne or be casheered of  
 his calling; so then our Ministers standing is lawfull, and their Baptisme  
 warrantable. I need not speake of the Service Booke, the Crosse, and Sur-  
 plesse, which were the onely things that troubled them, but they are re-  
 moved, and yet they stand out as much as ever, which shewes they have  
 proud and froward hearts, rather then any iust cause given to them, why  
 they should forsake our Churches. But suppose there were some exception  
 against our Ministers entrance or execution of their office, yet that will  
 not make their Baptisme void; the Lord was wrath with *Moses* and would  
 have killed him because his child was not circumcised, but when that was  
 done his wrath ceased, although it was done by his wife, a woman, and  
 an outlandish woman, and in her rage against God for commanding such  
 a service, and against *Moses* for being willing to yeeld unto such a service,  
 see *Exod. 4. 24, 25, 26*. Then may not our Ministers baptize as lawfully and  
 acceptably as this woman might circumcise. Now I grant, if our Mini-  
 sters should baptize in their own name, then their Baptisme would be void,  
*1 Cor. 13. 15*. but they use the right forme which Christ gave the Apostles,  
 in the name of the Trinity, *Matth. 28. 19*. and they use the right matter,  
 which is water, *Mat. 3. 22*. and on the right Subject, Christians Infants, as  
 hath been proved, and to the right end, which is, to distinguish them from  
 Heathens and Infidels, and to engage them to obey the Covenant, of  
 which Baptisme is a signe or token, and all this is done by Ministers law-  
 fully called; therefore they ought not to be re-baptized. Againe, Baptisme  
 is a Sacrament of the new birth, and although we may come often to the  
 other Sacrament, *1 Cor. 11. 25*, yet we can be borne but once; therefore we  
 must take this Sacrament but once, which is the signe of it. Againe, there  
 is but one Lord, one Faith, and one Baptisme, *Ephes. 4*. therefore the  
 Sacrament



Sacrament of Baptisme is to be administered but once. Their Objections are now to be answered.

First, they object, That if Christ said he had another Baptisme beside that he had of *John*, *Matth.* 3. 17. Then we may be againe baptized, but he saith, I have a Baptisme to be baptized with, and how am I straightned till it be accomplished, *Luke* 12. 50. then they may be againe baptized. *I answer*, That Baptisme of Christ was his sufferings, for, saith he, *to the Summe of Zebedy can yee drinke of the Cup that I drinke of, and be baptized with the Baptisme that I am baptized with*, and they said, *we are able*; Then he said, *you shall indeed drinke of the Cup that I drinke of, and be baptized with the Baptisme that I am baptized with*, *Mark.* 10. 38, 39. Therefore, saith *Paul*, *We are baptized into his death, and buried with him by Baptisme*, *Rom.* 6. 3, 4. So then Christ was but once baptized with water; no more must we; but then as Christ was killed and crucified afterwards, so must we kill and crucifie our finnes daily afterwards; Then here is no warrant to be re-baptized.

Secondly, They object, That if those that looke for a resurrection must be baptized at their death, then there is more Baptismes then one; but *Paul* saith, if the dead rise not, why are they baptized for the dead, what shall they doe that are baptized for the dead, *1 Cor.* 15. 29. therefore they may be againe baptized. *I answer*, Baptizing signifies washing, and it was the custome to wash the dead Corps, for when *Dorcas* was dead they washed her body, *Act.* 9. 37. but they that will be so baptized must tarry till they be dead, neither shall it be done by the Minister, but by them that shall winde them up and put them into the Coffin to be buried; but here is no Warrant to be re-baptized, from this Text, till after they be dead.

Thirdly, they object, That if some were twice baptized, then so may we, but some were first baptized by *John*, and afterwards, by *Paul*, *Act.* 19. v. 3, 5. then we may be againe baptized. *I answer*, some doe expound those words to be thus understood; saying, They were first baptized by some false Disciples of *John* into his name, and so it was void, and therefore they were baptized againe in the name of Christ, but this cannot be the meaning, for then *Paul* would have inquired after those Hereticks, for *Paul* was newly come from *Corinth*, v. 1. where he had cleared himselfe from the same thing, *1 Corinth.* 1. 13, 15. then sure he would not so put it up at *Ephesus*. 2. Some expound those words thus, saying, They were when *Paul* came to *Ephesus* onely taught the Doctrine of *John*, but not baptized of him, and so were baptized by *Paul*; but this is not the meaning neither, for they were believers and they were Disciples, v. 1, 2. therefore they were baptized of *John*, and yet they had not learned his Doctrine, for they neither knew *Jesus Christ* nor the Holy Ghost till *Paul* had told them, v. 3, 4.

Thirdly, The Anabaptists expound it thus; saying, They were baptized

with water first by *John*, and then againe with water by *Paul*; but this is not the meaning neither, for their second Baptisme is not done with water; but while *Paul* was expounding to them, who it was that *John* said should come after him, and baptize them with the Holy Ghost, that is, saith *Paul* Jesus Christ, *v. 4*. Now when they heard this they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, *v. 5*. that is, while *Paul* was expounding, their souls was converted and baptized with the Holy Ghost; neither is here any word that *Paul* baptized them, onely he made knowne Christ to them, and when the worke was done they were baptized, as it was while *Peter* spake the Holy Ghost fell on them which heard the Word, *Act. 10. 44*. So then here is the full meaning of these words, they were baptized with water by *John*, for they were Disciples and believers, that is, they believed that the Christian Religion was the true Religion, so that they were converted from heathenisme to christianity, but they were not converted from the state of corruption to the state of grace, though *John* had said, He that comes after me shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, but him they knew not, till *Paul* said, that is Jesus Christ; by that word when they heard that they were converted and their souls washed or baptized with the Holy Ghost. But it may be they will object, saying, The Holy Ghost was given to them afterwards, *v. 6*. I answer, That was the gift of miracles, to cure all diseases, to cast out Divels, and to speake with divers Tongues, yet this also is called Baptisme, for saith Christ, *You shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many daies hence, Act. 1. 5*. that is, the gift of miracles, but they had the sanctifying gift before, for it was the sanctifying gift that *John* had from the wombe, *Luk. 1. 15* this is that promise made to us and our children, *Act. 2. 38*. so then some times the outward forme is called Baptisme, and sometimes sanctification is called Baptisme, and some times the gift of miracles is called Baptisme, as *Act. 1. 5*. and all these three are together in that 19. of the Acts; for first they were baptized by water of *John*, and then baptized by the Holy Ghost by *Paul*'s teaching, and then they received the gift of miracles by *Paul*'s laying on of his hands, and all this is but one Baptisme, onely the outward forme is distinguished from the inward and reall worke of the Holy Ghost. Then this Text will not warrant their re-baptizing the second time with water.

Fourthly, they object, That if *Paul* spake of Baptismes in the Plural Number, then there is more Baptismes then one; but *Paul* speaks of Baptismes in the plural number, *Hebr. 6. 2*. therefore there is more then one. I answer; It is like *Paul* speaks of the outward and inward Baptisme, and the gift of miracles, and calls them altogether Baptismes in the plural number; or it may be he puts the sufferings of Christians, and washing their corps after death, which are called Baptismes, because the very next thing *Paul* speaketh of is the resurrection; howsoever if *Paul* here speaks of



of divers kinds of baptismes which it is most likely he doth; then this Text will not warrant a second baptism with water, but *Paul* here speaks of the Doctrine of Baptisme and not of the forme, therefore it makes nothing for the outward forme to re-baptize them againe with water.

Now as I was desired I shall give a brief Answer to Captaine *Hobson*s five Arguments; First saies he, the Baptisme of Infants doth directly deny Christ to be come in the flesh, because it keeps on foot that which was before Christ, and ended by Christ as come in the flesh; That is, saith he, the Covenant God made with *Abraham* which ran in the flesh, and was intailed to Generation, Gen. 17. 7, 12. to this Covenant saith he, Circumcision had reference, now those naturall branches are cut off Rom. 11. 20, 21. and now there are no Seed or Sonnes of *Abraham*, but beleivers, Gal. 3. 9, 14. 22. 28. 29. now the Promise is not a carnall, but a spirituall, John 3. 5.

*Ans.* To say the Covenant which Circumcision had reverence to was a Carnall Covenant, shewes but a carnall understanding of it, for it is called an everlasting Covenant many times in that Chapter, Gen. 17. neither was this Covenant of Grace made with *Abraham*, but saith the Lord, *I will establish my Covenant with thee, and thy seed, every man childe shall be circumcised, and this shall be a token of the Covenant, and this token shall be in your flesh for that everlasting Covenant, and my Covenant shall be established with Isaac.* Then the Covenant was no more made with *Abraham* then it was with *Isaac*, but established to both by that token of Circumcision, so then that circumcision was not a token of a carnall covenant, but a token of that eternall Covenant made between God the Father, and Christ his Sonne in our nature from all eternity: For, saith Christ, I was set up from everlasting before the world was, Pro. 8. 23. he was fore-ordained before the foundation of the world, 1 Pet. 1. 20. God made promises to Christ before the world began, Titus 1. 2. so then this eternall Covenant was not manifested by a token of it from the beginning of the world till *Abraham* had it, because till then no whole Nation was called into the visible Church; but if *Abraham* and his posterity had onely a token that they should enjoy the Land of Canaan it had been but *Esau*s blessing. Againe, to say that eternall Covenant was made to *Abraham* is to make him our Redeemer, for then he must performe the conditions of it for all the Elect, but (poore man) he had failings as well as other men, and not able to satisfie for his owne sinnes, much lesse for the sinnes of all the Elect, so then that covenant was made with his seed, and saith *Paul*, that seed was Christ, Gal. 3. 16. Againe marke the conclusion of Master *Hobson*, who said, *Abraham* received a token but of a carnall covenant, but if that were true, *Abraham* is damned, and then by and by he saith, the Seed and Sonnes of *Abraham* must be beleivers, Gal. 3. 7. 9. 14. 22. 28. 29. then sure he received

received the token of that everlasting Covenant. But how are we Gentiles the Seed and Sons of Abraham? *I answer.* By receiving the signe and token of that everlasting covenant as a seale to our faith, as he did, Rom. 4. 11. and we are his children by receiving the same faith in Christ as he had, but we are not *Abrahams* children as Christ is our everlasting Father, who stood as a generall Person representing all the Elect, and receiving a covenant for them, and able to fulfill the conditions of it, and to satisfy Gods Justice for the breach of *Adams* covenant, and able to worke faith in us to enter into his covenant: But when *Abraham* is named, we must understand him as an Embassadour, representing Christ the King of his Church, with whom alone the new covenant was made, as the first was made with *Adam*, and all we come under it when we take upon us his naturall Image; so the second covenant was made with Christ, and the Elect come under it when they receive his spirituall Image: so then the tokens of the covenant were before Christ came in the Flesh, and Christ did not come to take away the token of the covenant, but to change them from Circumcision to Baptisme, and to enlarge them to all Nations, and to Females as well as Males, Acts 8. 12. then the keeping on foot this token of the covenant which Christ instituted after his comming in the flesh doth not deny his comming in the flesh, neither is this to hold circumcision which was the token before his comming in the flesh, then this Argument falls to nothing, whereby he would prove Infants Baptisme to deny the comming of Christ in the flesh. But then he saith, the Pharisees and Sadduces pleading that they were *Abrahams* Seed, and would be Baptized, and yet *John* would not till they repent and beleve, Mat. 3. 7. 8. 9. *I answer.* If they had repented of their Sects and Schismes he would have Baptized them, for no ignorant Person was refused by him, although they had not heard whether there was any Holy Ghost, yet *John* baptized them unto repentance and bid them beleve, and such were made Disciples, Acts 19. 12, 34. but *John* knew that such Sectaries would be but as Vipers to the true Religion, therefore he would not baptize them unlesse they would leave their Heresie and Schisme. Then it was not because they were of the Seed of *Abraham* that he refused it, but because they would not leave their Heresies and Schismes, this cannot keepe Infants from Baptisme which have no Sects nor Schismes to repent of. But he hath another Argument to prove that the baptizing of Infants directly denies the comming of Christ in the flesh, and that is this, He saith it takes from Christ his Prophetickall and Kingly Offices, which the Holy Ghost gave him, as come in the Flesh. *I answer.* Christ had those Offices before he came in the flesh, he was King, and Priest to the Church of the Jewes, although not so manifest as to the christian Church, but how the baptizing of Infants should rob Christ of those Offices is a Paradox to all wise men. But  
 he



he saith, because it makes the Old Testament to expound the New, but what of this, Christ eates with sinners, and some were offended at it, and he sends them to the Old Testament, saying, *Learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice*, Mat. 9. 13. but did Christ by this lose his Prophetick Office, by sending them to the Old Testament to expound his doings in the New? there is no truth in this Argument, nor in the thing that he would prove by it. But then he saith, baptizing of Infants robs Christ of his Kingly Office in giving Lawes, and making it a duty to baptize infants. *I answer*. They have a command from Christ to teach and baptize all Nations, but how is a Nation taught but when those of yeeres receive the christian Religion, and make profession of it by a positive Law of that Land, or else it were impossible that any Nation should be either taught or baptized, and so the Communion of Christ would be to no purpose, and if children were excluded, how shall the Nations come in, as is promised? Isa. 22. Micah 4. 2. but the truth is, if the Parents be of the Christian Religion it is potentially in the childe, and the Parents have power to bring them up in that Religion, and therefore ought to baptize them in it, but I shall speake more of this in answer to his third Argument; but this may suffice to prove that we have a command to baptize infants; Then we doe not intrench upon the Kingly Office of Christ, and there is neither sence nor reason to say, if we did intrench upon his Kingly Office, that this were to deny his comming in the flesh, when as his Kingly Office was before as well as since his comming in the flesh, then all this hinders not infants Baptisme; so much in answer to his first Argument, I shall be briefer in the rest.

His second Argument is this, Infants Baptisme hath no part of Righteousnesse in it, therefore it ought not to be done, his Proposition is proved thus; Whatsoever is considered as a part of Righteousnesse was seene in the Person or Practise of Christ, but infants Baptisme was neither seene in his Person nor Practise, for he was not baptized in his infancy, neither did he baptize any infants, and yet he saith it becomes us to fulfill all righteousness, Mat. 3. 15. therefore infants may not be baptized. *I answer*; Christ came to fulfill the Morall Law, and so to free his people from that bond of perfect obedience to it, and he suffered the penalty due to our sinnes, to free us from the curse of it; thus by his Active and Passive obedience he fulfilled all righteousness, this he did in his owne Person alone, and there was none with him, Isa. 63. 3. Psal. 47. 8. but here in his answer to *Iohn Baptist* he doth not say, it becometh me, but *it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness*, Mat. 3. 15. Nay the action was *Iohns*, and not his, for Jesus came to him to be baptized, verse 13. so then I conceive the meaning to be this, *Iohn* was sent or commanded to baptize with Water, see John 1. 33. and he that beleeveth that Jesus was the Sonne of God

was

was to be baptized, Acts 8. 37. but Jesus, as a man, beleeveth this, and therefore in obedience to that command was to doe it, and Jesus to suffer it, thus saith Jesus, *It becommeth us to fulfill all righteousness*, but it did not become *Iohn* to baptize before he was sent to doe it, nor Jesus to suffer before the command was given to *Iohn* to baptize, John 3. 33. Then he could not be baptized in his infancy, because the command was not then given. Again, if he had been baptized in his infancy, then it might be questioned whether men of yeares might be baptized; neither would the Heathen have suffered their children, unlesse themselves had been admitted to baptism; and Christ was baptized in the middle of his age, that neither infants nor old age might be excluded from baptism. Again, Jesus came to be Baptized as soone as there was one appointed and sent to doe it, then if we have lawfull Ministers found to baptize our Infants, we ought to suffer them to doe it, because it becommeth us to fulfill the righteous command of Christ; but if it be with us as it was with Christ, that we have no lawfull Minister to doe it till we be of his age, then we may lawfully stay as long as he did before we baptize our infants. But then the Captaine saith, If God would have had Jesus baptized sooner, he would have sent one sooner to doe it. To this I may say, If God would not have our infants baptized, then he would not send Ministers to them so soone to doe it. And whereas the Captaine saith, It is no part of righteousness because Christ baptized no infants. To this I may answer, Christ baptized none at all with water, John 4. 2. then if this Argument were good, it is no part of righteousness to baptize infants either young or old; but I shall prove it to be a part of righteousness to baptize infants in answer to his next Argument, but for the present you see his proves removed by which he would prove infants baptism to have no part of righteousness in it, and therefore his Proposition must needs fall; and notwithstanding this Argument christian infants ought to be baptized.

His third Argument is this, The baptism of infants is not the baptism of Christ, because it doth not answer his commission, Mat. 28. 19, 20. which is, *Goe teach, discipling and baptizing*, hence he concludes, that they must be taught, and disciplined, and beleeveth before they can be baptized, Marke 16. 16. and this no infant can be, and so cannot answer the commission, therefore must not be baptized. *I answer*. That infants baptism is according to the commission of Christ, for according to his Exposition whole Nations must be taught, and disciplined, and made beleeveth, else they were sent to doe that which is impossible. But how can a whole Nation be taught, disciplined, and made beleeveth? *I answer*. There is a two-fold conversion, and two Sacraments answerable to this two-fold conversion; the first conversion is a turning from false religion to the true religion, and the other is a conversion from corrupted nature



to the state of grace? now he that hath the first of these to believe Christ to be the Son of God, and that the Christian Religion is the true Religion, this man may be discipled being thus taught, and so may receive the first Sacrament; yea thus a whole Kingdom may be taught and may believe the true Religion, and so discipled, and receive the Sacrament of Baptisme; yea when the Governours of a Kingdom shall be taught and believe the Christian Religion to be the true Religion, and shall settle it amongst them by a positive Law of the Land, and all parents and people of yeers in that Kingdom consent unto it, then all that Kingdom is taught and must all be baptized; for, what the parents have done, the children have potentially done, because it is in the power of those parents to bring them up in that Religion, and not suffer their infants to be of any other; and having this power, they may also set the token or mark of distinction upon them, to baptize them that they may be known from *Turks* and *Heathens*. Now if parents had not this power, then no Kingdom could ever receive the Gospel and be a holy Nation as the *Jew's* was; and so their priviledge would exceed the priviledge of all Christian Kingdoms; for there will be children to the end of the world; for till then, they will marry and be given in marriage till the last day. Then, as *Abraham* and the *Jews* received their Religion for themselves and their children, so must Christians, and set the token of the Covenant upon them as they did. But then, for the other conversion which makes them fit for the other Sacrament, the Lords Supper, it is not in the power of the parents; although they can bring them up in the Christian Religion, yet they cannot convert them from the state of corruption to the state of grace; and although they be able to discern when they conform to the true Religion, yet they cannot see into their souls whether there be true Faith in them; that new name written none knows but he that hath it: then, although it be said, *Teach and baptize all Nations*: yet it is not said, *Teach and give the Lords Supper to all Nations*; for it is not in the power of man to teach effectually the heart of another, nor to know when they are so taught; none but himself knows whether he discern the Lords Body, or whether he feed by Faith or remember the Death of Christ, or whether he have truly examined himself; therefore the worthinesse or unworthinesse lies upon himself, and the charge also. Let every man examine himself, and so let him eat. Neither must any baptized Christian be kept from the Lords Supper, unlesse he by the leaven of errour seek to undermine the truth of Christian Religion, or by prophaneesse trample the Christian profession underfoot, *Matth. 16. 12. 1 Cor. 5. 12, 13. 2 Cor. 2. 5, 6. Gal. 5. 9, 10.* and then it must be done in a legall way, not by the Minister alone nor by the Congregation alone, but by the Eldership, the offence being scandalous. So then, the first conversion being in the power of the parents, and potentially in the children already, they may and ought to be baptized.

But then he saith, *The Baptism of infants cannot be a Baptism of Faith and Repentance, and therefore it is not the Baptism of Christ.* But in regard he hath no proof for it, I refer him to my answer to the second and third Objection, and conclude that Baptism of infants is not excluded from the Communion of Christ; and it is a Baptism unto Faith and Repentance, and therefore they ought to be baptized.

His fourth Argument. He saith, *Baptism of infants doth cause inconveniences in the Church; first, because we make them Members of the Church before they be called of God, which is contrary to these Scriptures, 1 Cor. 1. 1. and 2 Cor. 1. 1.* I answer, Though the Corinthians were sanctified in Christ Jesus, and called to be Saints, yet all in the Church were not such; for there was heresies and prophaneſſe: the incestuous person was not cast out; and the Lords Supper was prophaned; and more carnall men then spirituall; and many divisions, some of *Paul* and some of *Apollo*. Then, Were these all Saints? No. He writes in the judgement of charity, and directs his Epistle chiefly to such as were Saints indeed; so then in the judgement of charity, we should think the best of those in the Church that use the means to attain salvation; and so you may judge of infants who are brought up in the true Religion: And although Heathens must have a call to Christianity, yet when Christians are called, their children need not to tarry for such a call, because they have no false Religion to be called from. Neither was it any inconvenience to the *Jews* that their infants had the token of the Covenant upon them before their calling; but rather a grace and glory to their Church, and a benefit to those infants to engage them to obedience of that Covenant when they came to age, of which they had received a token. So all the people and the Publicans justified Christ when they heard him being baptized of *John*; when as the Pharisees and Lawyers rejected the Counsell of God against themselves, being not baptized of him, *Luke 7. 29. 30.* Then as we would have them justify Christ and not to reject his Counsell, let them be baptized. But he saith, *Another inconvenience it is to have our infants baptized, because it will intaile priviledges to us in reference to generation.* But to these priviledges he saith, *They must be sanctified*, quoting that place I answered already, *2 Cor. 1. 1.* Yet I say they are sanctified or set apart from *Turks* and *Heathens* for the Christian Church; else were they unclean, but now they are holy, *1 Cor. 7. 14.* then they ought to be baptized. But he hath a third inconvenience, and that is, *If infants be baptized, it will make a separation and distraction in Christs conjunction, and that is to baptize such as they will not give the Lords Supper, nor admit them nor others to break Bread; Christ would have them to do both, and they will admit such as cannot do both.* But he hath no reason why some may not do some duties when they are disabled to do others; and therefore I refer him to my answer to the tenth Objection, and hither too: for all his inconveniences.



niences, I see no good Argument to keep infants of Christians from Baptism.

Fifthly: He saith, *The baptizing of infants doth directly crosse the proceedings both in the time of the Law and in the time of the Gospel, and therefore it ought not to be done; for they did all, both under the Law and in the time of the Gospel, by a rule; else Lot might have pleaded the same priviledge with Abraham, being a Beleever as well as he; and Ishmael who was no Beleever in God, yet he was circumcised.* I answer: The promise to Abraham was, that his seed in Isaac should be the visible Church, who onely should have the token of the Covenant; and this excludes Lot from this priviledge: and for Ishmael, he being one of his Family, by vertue of another command, was circumcised, when the Lord would have Abraham to make his own house an example or a patern for all his posterity, to circumcise in his house, *Gen. 17. 12, 13.* But, saith the Lord, *I will establisth my Covenant with Isaac, ver. 21.* Onely Strangers had this benefit by living amongst them. So then, by the like reason our children (although as bad as Ishmael) may be baptized; when as some true Beleevers amongst the Turks may not be baptized except they come to us and make an open profession of the Christian Religion; then they may have this benefit amongst us. But have not we a rule for what we do, when as the command of Christ is our direction, who commands all Nations to be taught and baptized? and if he command it, he will have it done, although the Anabaptists would bar the Christian Church from that benefit to be a holy Nation, as the Church of the Jews was flat against many promises that whole Nations should come into the Christian Church, and Christs command to teach and baptize all Nations. But I have answered this in reply to Master Hobson's third Argument; and so notwithstanding their Objections and Arguments made against baptizing of Christian infants, I see no sufficient ground to bar them from the Ordinance of Baptism.

*The second Point is, that sprinkling the baptized more agreeth with the minde of Christ, then dipping or plunging the baptized in or under the water.*

Now I come to the second Point to prove that sprinkling the baptized more agreeth to the minde of Christ, then dipping or plunging the baptized in or under the water:

First, Because Baptism is a Sacrament or visible signe to our corporall eyes, to put us in minde of the thing signified, as the Rainbow shall be seen in the clouds, which was the token of the Covenant, *Gen. 9. 11, 14.* and Moses took blood and sprinkled it on the people and said, *Behold the blood of the Covenant, Exodus 24. 7.* But when the baptized are plunged

under water; they can neither behold the signes or token of the Covenant, nor hear the words of Institution to put them in minde of the Covenant or thing signified; they cannot have their senses exercised as they ought, *Heb. 5. 14.* because their life is in danger to be lost; and a drunken man or a mad man is as fit to make use of the signe, as a man under water, being out of his element; therefore the baptized ought not to be plunged under water.

Secondly, If they should stand on the bank and plunge the baptized into the water, in so doing they may break his neck against the bottom, if the water be shallow; or if deep, they may drown him; neither dare they jump in to save his life lest they drown themselves; and if they should have one in the River to catch him, then there cannot be lesse then two to baptize one man, which is contrary to all examples in Scripture. Then, it being so dangerous to plunge the baptized into the water, whether it be deep or shallow, I would intreat them to shew me when there is neither too much nor too little water, to avoid these dangers; for till then, I shall hold it unlawfull to plunge the baptized in or under water.

Thirdly, The Jaylor and all his were baptized in the night; but if they had been so plunged, sure they would have either killed or drowned them; neither could they avoid it, because at midnight they could not see their rising; neither do I read that they jumped in to endanger their own lives to save them: then sure they were not plunged into it.

Fourthly, If they so plunge the baptized into the water, being naked, it is against modesty; *But, saith Paul, let all things be done decently, 1 Cor. 14. 40.* and so doing were a temptation; for *David* seeing a naked woman washing her self, was tempted to that foul sin of adultery, *2 Sam. 11. 2, 4.* and *Christ* hath taught us to say, *Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil, Matth. 6.* Then sure the administration of this holy Ordinance must be free from so foul a temptation as to see the nakednesse of each other. Then it is unlawfull to plunge the baptized naked into the water.

Fifthly, If they have drawers for that use, they are sure the holy Breeches of *Aaron*, as bad as the Prelates Surplesse; and for Women to wear them, being mans Apparell, is an abomination to the Lord, *Dent. 22. 5.* therefore not to be plunged in drawers appointed for that use.

Sixthly, If they say that they were plunged in their Wearing Clothes, is more then they can prove; yea, it seems they were not so plunged in their Wearing Clothes; for when *Lydia* and the *Jaylor* were baptized, although at several times, they feasted the Apostles straight-way, *Act. 16. 15, 33, 34.* But we do not finde that they shifted themselves either before or after that Ordinance: Then, did they sit at meat together dung-wet as they came out of the water? if they say, yea, then they must prove it, and till then, we shall



shall not believe that they were plunged into the water in their Wearing Clothes.

Sevently, If they had any Clothes upon them when they were plunged into the water, then the water could not touch them all over, and so they had as good be sprinkled on one place for all.

Eightly, Many were baptized in their Houses, as *Paul* and *Cornelius*, and others, *Acts* 9. 17. 18. and 10. 25. 48. And the *Taylor* was baptized at midnight in the Prison; But what Vessel could these be so plunged in, and where had they such a Vessel in the Prison, and filled with water so suddenly, as to be all baptized the same hour, and at midnight? And what Vessel had *Peter* to baptize three thousand in some few hours space? *Acts* 2. 41. If their Vessel could hold but two or three together, did they empty it so many times? And who fetcht all that water? And it may be some of them were diseased, and others would not be plunged in the same water, and so they emptied it three thousand times over: But did *Peter* stand in the Vessel all that time, or was he in the water at all, or *Ananias* when he baptized *Paul* in the House, or *Peter* when he baptized *Cornelius* in the House, or *Paul* when he baptized the *Taylor*? Till this be proved, we shall not believe that they were plunged in the water.

Ninthly, The Sacraments must be Administred where the Word is Preached; for saith Christ, *Teach all Nations baptizing them, Matth.* 28. 19. He doth not say Preach in one place, and then take them to a River to plunge them: And to hold that one Ordinance alone is to be administred apart from the meeting place of the Assembly for all other publike duties, is sure the Popish Pilgrimage, or at least his going a Precessioning; for it was never justified of Christ, and therefore to be abhorred of Christians.

Tenthly, Water is a signe of the *Blood of Christ*, which is called the *Blood of sprinkling*, having sprinkled our hearts from an evil conscience, *Heb.* 10. 20. and 12. 24. And *Moses* sprinkled the people, and said, *Behold the blood of the Covenant, Exod.* 24. 8. And the Lord saith, *I will sprinkle you with clean water, and ye shall be clean, Ezek.* 36. 25. Then why should not this Prophecy be fulfilled in sprinkling the baptized? And why should not the signe of Water resemble the substance by sprinkling? Therefore the baptized ought rather to be sprinkled, then plunged into the Water; and because Christ saith, *If I wash one part, thou art clean every whit, John* 13. 8. Then sprinkling and not plunging, is most agreeing to the minde of Christ.

Lastly, I fear they do not so plunge the baptized as they do professe, but rather let them wade into the water themselves, and so themselves baptize half their body without their help, and without any word of Institution from them, and then they come afterwards and baptize the other

half in the name of the Trinity: But if this be their manner, they contradict their own Tenet, and condemn themselves in so doing: And what a shameful thing it is for them to report that they plunge the baptized into the Water, when as they wade in themselves? And so while they judge us for baptizing one part for all, they condemn themselves for doing the same thing, *Rom. 2. 1.* From these grounds we may safely conclude, That sprinkling the baptized is more agreeing to the minde of Christ, then to plunge the baptized into the water.

But to these Arguments Master *Patience* said something, although to small purpose.

First, saith he, I take dipping to be the command of Christ, because Master *Daniel Rogers* doth say That the *Greek* word doth signifie washing by plunging; and he saith, Sprinkling is rinsing, and not to baptize, as Master *Blackwood* doth prove from *Greek* Authors; but I then replied saying, *Are you a Teacher in Israel, and know not these things? John 3. 10.* Have you the care of souls committed unto you, and do you feed them by hearsay, because you are not able to interpret the Word your self? What is this *But the blinde leads the blinde, till both fall into the ditch?* And what comfort will it be to you at the day of Judgement, having seduced many souls, in giving them poyson instead of wholesome food; for you to say then that men told you it was good for them, when as Christ never told you so? And if we should go by hearsay, we might bring multitudes of Orthodox Divines and Churches that well understand the Language in which Christ spake unto his Church, to witnesse, That the word *Baptize* signifies as well *Sprinkling* as *Plunging*.

Secondly, But then he said *Baptism* signified *Burial*, and putting on whole Christ on whole man: But this I grant, For in sprinkling, the baptized are under water, as well as in plunging; for the Minister holds the water over the baptized, and so the baptized is wholly under it; when as in plunging them into the water, it may be some part of them was not wholly under it: And besides, when the Minister holds the water over them, it is all one as to put them under it, when as it may be the *Anabaptists* wade in and put themselves half under, flat against their own Tenet: And then they grant, that the putting the other half into the water, is a putting on whole Christ: Then by the same Argument, by sprinkling one part, Christ may be wholly put on as well as by their practise; and the *Jews* by circumcising one part, they were circumcised all over, and so put on whole Christ. Again, although it be said *Baptism* saves, it is not by the outward washing, because every part of the body was washed, but rather by the answer of a good conscience. But this is not done by *Burial*, but rather by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, *1 Peter 3. 21.*

Thirdly, Then he said that *John Dipped in Jordan*; but I may as well say;



he Sprinkled in Jordan; for he saith, *I indeed baptize with water, Matth. 3. 11.* But the word *with* is not always in there; there was *with* the Angel a multitude, *Luke 1. 13.* I hope you will not say they were in the Angel; and if I were with you, I hope you would not say that I were in you: So then to baptize with water may be by sprinkling the baptized, and not by plunging them into the water; and to put in for *with* is as bad a mistake as that of the Prelates, who would bow at the Name of *Jesus* instead of *In the Name of Jesus*, from that place *Phil. 2. 10.* So you will baptize with the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, instead of *in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*: Because to baptize with water, you will have it all one as to be baptized in the water, by plunging the baptized under, or into the water.

Fourthly, Then he said, *If Christ command to dip, then sprinkling is but a grosse invention of man*; but then he did not prove that Christ did onely command to dip, and not to sprinkle, but to baptize, which signifies both: Then we may sprinkle the baptized with as good, if not better warrant, then they may plunge them into the water.

Fifthly, Suppose they say Christ came out of the water, *Matth. 3. 16.* And it is said *Philip and the Eunuch* went both into the water, *Acts 8. 38.* Hence they conclude, That the Baptized ought to be plunged into the water. *Answer*, If they waded into the water, then they were not plunged into it: Neither is it said that either Christ or the Eunuch were plunged into the water; neither doth their going into the water hinder but they may be sprinkled; for in those hot Countreys they went bare-foot, and it is likely they went in some distance from the side, that they might come at clear water, and then both *John* and *Philip* might sprinkle them *In the Name of the Trinity*: And I think the *Anabaptists* have nothing to say from Scripture or Reason against it.

I shall here conclude with one Quere, which is this, *If our Ministers be lawfully sent and authorized from Christ, and the Presbytery, to Preach and Baptize, and they do administer this Ordinance of Baptism in the right Form In the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and with the right Matter, being Water, and on the right Parties, being either men of years when they are converted to the Christian Religion, or to Infants born of Christians; and to the right end, which is to distinguish them from Turks and Infidels, and as an engagement to us all to go on in obedience of the true Christian Religion: And lastly, That Christ should ratifie that outward Form of Baptism according as John the Baptist foretold, and baptized them with the Holy Ghost,*

I would know this of the *Anabaptists*, how they dare to renounce this outward Form of Baptism thus rightly administred in our Church, and ratified by the Holy Ghost, and all because it was done upon them when they

they were Infants; therefore the very Baptism of the Holy Ghost is de-  
spised; or it may be because they were not plunged into the water.  
Therefore the outward Form and the inward Baptism of the Holy Ghost  
is despised of them; when as they may see the vanity of plunging by the  
forementioned Arguments against it. But will they cast away both the  
outward and inward Seal and Token of the Covenant, when administered  
by persons lawfully called to do it, who do it in the right Form, on the  
right Parties, with the right Matter, and to the right end; and all this  
confirmed by the Holy Ghost as by a faithful witness that cannot lie?  
But will they despise the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, because it was done  
upon Infants, or because they were sprinkled and not plunged into the  
water? And so like Witches renounce the Covenant of Grace, and cast  
away both the outward and inward Seals of it, when they enter into Co-  
venant with the Devil; so these people, it is to be feared, many of them  
do commit that unpardonable sin, when they turn *Anabaptists*, despising  
and trampling under feet the Spirit of God, whereby they *should be Sealed*  
*to the day of Redemption*; For commonly they go on in a final Apostacy,  
and not one of Ten thousand ever returns; yea, many of them in these days  
are run so far from God, that they do not believe that there is either God  
or Devil, Heaven or Hell, Church of Grace or Glory; Thus they are now  
fallen to notorious Atheism, calling themselves *Seekers* of the foremen-  
tioned things, which for the present they have lost.



FINIS.





The severall

24

# COPIES

OF THE

Kings LETTERS, and MESSAGES,

SENT TO THE

## PARLIAMENT:

FIRST,

About a Treatie by Commissioners, and  
then Personally by Himselfe: With the  
PARLIAMENTS severall Answers thereunto,  
and some Observations thereupon..

WITH,

The COPY of a PAPER under the Lord  
*Inchiquins* hand, concerning the Popes Nuntio  
now in *Ireland*, and his proceedings there about the  
Bill of Bargain and Sale of that KINGDOME.

These Letters from the King to the Parliament, and their An-  
swers to His Majesty, With the Observations thereupon, are  
Printed and Published according to Order.

London, Printed for Jane Coe, 1646.